

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended and Claims 4-6 are added. Applicants respectfully submit no new material is presented herein.

Claims 1-3 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,862,570 to Lezuch et al. (hereinafter "Lezuch"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a door checker for an automobile including, among other features, a recess formed in an inner surface of each ball housing, wherein the recess retains a grease therein and also accommodates dust.

As explained in the originally filed application, conventional door checkers require the application of the ball and the ball housing to provide smooth rotation of the balls in the ball housings and the rolling of the balls in the ball guide grooves.

However, the inventors of the present invention discovered that following drawbacks with conventional door checkers: 1) if the door checker is used over a long term, dust deposited in each of the ball guide grooves may enter a space between the ball and the ball housing with the rolling of the ball, thereby hindering the rotation of the ball within the ball housing to stick the ball, and 2) the ball ultimately rubs the ball guide groove without rolling within the ball guide groove, thereby causing an increased resistance to the opening and closing of the door, as well as a somewhat unpleasant friction-caused noise.

The inventors of the present invention have sought to provide a door checker for an automobile, wherein dust that causes the balls to stick within their respective ball

holders is prevented while ensuring that the balls will rotate and roll smoothly within their respective ball housings over a long term. With the recess feature of the door checker, when the ball is rolled in the ball guide groove while being rotated in the ball housing due to the opening and closing of the door, the surface of the ball is lubricated by the grease retained in the recess in the ball housing, thereby facilitating a smooth rotation of the ball in the ball housing and the rolling of the ball in the ball guide groove. As such, if dust enters a space between the surface of the ball and the inner surface of the ball housing accompanied by the rotation of the ball, the dust is pushed out and held in the nearby recess by a surface pressure between the ball and a landing portion and a cleaning effect provided by the grease. Hence, the invention recited by Claim 1 avoids dust from adhering to the surface of the ball. Therefore, the recess of the door checker recited by Claim 1 ensures the smooth rotation and rolling of the ball over a long term, and prevents the generation of a friction noise due to the rubbing of the ball guide groove by the ball. See the paragraph bridging pages 1-2 to the first full paragraph on page 3 of the originally filed application.

Applicants have reviewed Lezuch in detail and are unable to provide any disclosure or suggestion that the ball holders (62) include a recess on an inner surface of each holder, wherein the recess retains grease and any dust therein. The Office Action asserts the ball holders (62) disclosed by Lezuch include a recess, which is defined by the inner-open surface between flanges (66)), that maintain proper *self lubricating* properties between the balls relative to the ball housings.

Applicants respectfully submit Lezuch lacks any discussion or suggestion as to the presence of any grease in the portion of the ball holders (62) within which the balls (68) are seated and rotate.

Rather, Lezuch appears to disclose the very conventional ball checkers that were discussed by the Applicants on pages 1-3 of the instant application. In particular, Lezuch appears to disclose balls (68) that are greased prior to being seated in their respective ball guide members (62). Hence, Lezuch suffers from the very drawbacks of the conventional door checkers which the inventors have sought to eliminate, that is, dust getting stuck to the balls (68), thereby preventing the smooth rotation of each ball (68). Lezuch does not teach or remotely suggest the ball guide members (62) each have a recess that retains a grease therein, wherein the grease continuously lubricates the balls (68) rotating within their respective ball guide members (62).

Moreover, Applicants respectfully request the passage(s) and any illustrated feature of Lezuch which supposedly discloses or somehow suggests the presence of a recess retaining grease therein be identified. Based on Applicants understanding, the Office Action is merely asserting the portion of the ball guide member (62) within which the ball (68) sits is somehow self-lubricating, yet the Office Action does not identify any passage of Lezuch where such a feature is taught. Additionally, Applicants have been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion within Lezuch wherein a grease is retained in the portion of the ball guide member (62) where the respective balls (68) sit.

The, Applicants respectfully, but forcefully, submit Lezuch fails to teach or suggest a recess being formed in an inner surface of each ball housing, wherein the

recess retains a grease on an inner surface of each ball housing and accommodates dust.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically disclose, each feature of a rejected claim.

As explained above, Lezuch does not appear to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1 since Lezuch fails to teach or suggest a recess being formed in an inner surface of each ball housing, wherein the recess retains a grease on an inner surface of each ball housing and accommodates dust therein.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Lezuch and should be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 2-6 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, allowance of Claims 1-6, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107348-00354.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM:MO/elp